

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/591,035	06/09/2000	Laurence E. England	STL9-2000-0063US1	2584
24852	7590	09/08/2004	EXAMINER	
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP IP LAW 555 BAILEY AVENUE , J46/G4 SAN JOSE, CA 95141			MIRZA, ADNAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/591,035	ENGLAND ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Adnan M Mirza	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/06/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helgeson et al (U.S. 2002/0073236) and in view of O'Brien et al (U.S. 6,351,776).

As per claims 1,9,17 Helgeson disclosed a method of adapting a transaction-based application to process transactions over a network, said transaction-based application comprising source code describing a transaction and information related to the transaction, hereinafter related information, said method comprising: scanning the source code of the transaction-based application to identify the transaction and the related information (Page 2, col. 0016); storing in a database the related information identified in the scan of the source code, hereinafter identified information (Page. 19, Paragraph, 0381-0382); extracting from the database parameter definitions describing communication of information by the transaction, hereinafter extracted information; identifying a parameter usage type for each parameter (Page. 12, col. 0277-0278, Page. 48, col. 0836), said parameter usage type selectable from the parameter usage type set comprising input, output, input/output, and unreferenced; displaying the transaction and a subset of the related information and extracted information (Page. 19, col. 0387);

Art Unit: 2141

However Helgeson did disclose in details allowing a user to select the transaction; and using the identified information and extracted information to package the user-selected transaction in a form compatible with a connector building tool.

In the same field of endeavor O'Brien disclosed the user must be sent back to the same database query is made at step 740 to determine if that database is still up. If it is, the request is passed to the pool specification where it is subsequently passed to the database object, on to the connection pool and the appropriate database, either the transactional database or the query database (col. 15, lines 21-27).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated the user must be sent back to the same database query is made at step 740 to determine if that database is still up. If it is, the request is passed to the pool specification where it is subsequently passed to the database object, on to the connection pool and the appropriate database, either the transactional database or the query database as taught by O'Brien in the method of Helgeson to make it efficient for the files to be available worldwide through the Internet and providing means by which files and other data may be stored on the Internet and made available worldwide through the Internet.

3. As per claims 2,18 Helgeson-O'Brien disclosed wherein the compatible form comprises a parsable file containing information which can be parsed by a connector building tool (O'Brien, col. 15, lines 11-19).

Art Unit: 2141

4. As per claims 3,11,19 Helgeson-O'Brien disclosed further comprising generating a documentation file describing the par sable file (O'Brien, col. 13, lines 39-49).
5. As per claims 4,12,20 Helgeson-O'Brien disclosed wherein the documentation file comprises field description information and connection information (O'Brien, col. 13, lines 39-49).
6. As per claims 5,13,21 Helgeson-O'Brien disclosed using the identified information and extracted information to build a connector (O'Brien, col. 15, lines 21-41).
7. As per claims 6,14,22 Helgeson-O'Brien disclosed comprising using the identified information and extracted information to build an enterprise Java bean connector (O'Brien, col. 15, lines 21-41).
8. As per claims 7,15,23 Helgeson-O'Brien disclosed wherein the database can be queried to find program parts comprising the transaction-based application and identify relationships between the program parts (Helgeson, Page. 12, col. 0277-0278)
9. As per claims 8,16,24 Helgeson-O'Brien disclosed wherein the related information is a member of the set comprising relationships, call hierarchies, transactions, communication areas, parameters, the flow of data elements, and resources employed (Helgeson, Page. 21, col.0420).

Art Unit: 2141

Applicant's arguments are as follows:

10. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose scanning application source code for a transaction or any type of scanning of application source code.

As to applicant's argument Helegeson disclosed system may also include a monitor component for monitoring changes of a data object at a system, with the monitoring component having both a system independent service subcomponent and a system specific service component utilizing a native API of the monitored system to monitor changes of the data object (Page. 2, Paragraph 0016).

11. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose extracting from the database parameter definitions describing communication information by the transaction; and identifying a parameter usage type for each parameter, said parameter usage type selectable from the parameter usage type set comprising input, output, input/output, and unreferenced.

As to applicants argument Helegeson disclosed automatic persistence service provided by the application server enhances the productivity of bean developers, is more efficient at runtime, and allows the bean definition to be independent of the type of data store used for persistence (e.g., a relational database or an object-oriented database). A component developer will be responsible for declaring part or all of the attributes of an entity bean as persistent in its deployment

Art Unit: 2141

descriptor and then mapping them to fields in a database at deployment time (Page. 19, Paragraph. 0382).

12. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose displaying a subset of the related information identified in the scan of the source code.

As to applicants argument Helegeson disclosed Model developers are typically java programmers, since the bulk of the development effort is implementing a companion Java Bean that invokes the appropriate SABA Manager API. They can use the dynamic features of the engine (tag libraries and java scripts) to place data from bean onto the page (Page. 29, Paragraph. 0545).

13. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose that “user to link a transaction-based application on the mainframe to the internet and/or worldwide web, where the transaction based application was not originally designed for web or internet based transactions.”

As to applicants argument O’Brien disclosed “each of the web servers in the network may handle HTTP request for static content such as HTML and graphic files. The web servers may proxy all requests for dynamic content to a Java application network 122” (col. 7, lines 55-59). However between tiers, the individual networks themselves may be available such that a web server in Illinois may pass request for dynamic content to java application clusters in Wisconsin (col. 7, lines 64-67).

Art Unit: 2141

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (703)-305-4633.

15. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dharia Rupal can be reached on (703)-305-4003. The fax for this group is (703)-746-7239.

16. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)-746-7239 (For Status Inquiries, Informal or Draft Communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT");

(703)-746-7239 (For Official Communications Intended for entry, please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE"),

(703)-746-7238 (For After Final Communications).

17. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-3900.

Any response to a final action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2141

BOX AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C.20231


Or faxed to:

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to 4th Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II,
2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202.

AM

Adnan Mirza

Examiner


Paul Kang
Primary Examiner